

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application after the Amendment. Claims 1, 5, and 13 are independent. In light of the amendments and remarks contained herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner maintained his rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Donoho et al.* (USP 6,801,929) in view of *Focsancanu et al.* (USP 5,991,292); claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Donoho et al.* and *Focsancanu et al.*, and further in view of *Stumer* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0064271); and claims 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Donoho et al.* and *Focsancanu et al.* and further in view of *Kang* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0074450). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103 – *Donoho et al.* / *Focsancanu et al.*

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner maintained his rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Donoho et al.* in view of *Focsancanu et al.* Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the *Donoho et al.* discloses a properties file producing device (Fig. 5, item 50, advisory file) wherein when information is received at the communication device, a determination is made on how to provide the received information based on settings included in the properties file, citing to col. 16, lines 10-15 and col. 23, lines 27-57. The Examiner admits that *Donoho et al.* fails to teach or suggest which of the plurality of devices on the local area network will perform the informing job. The Examiner relies on the teachings of *Focsancanu et al.* to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of *Donoho et al.* citing to col. 15, lines 33-50. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization of these references.

Claim 1 recites a properties file producing device that produces a properties file showing settings related to at least one of the following: whether or not an informing job has priority over

other informing jobs, whether the informing job will be performed automatically or manually, a range of the informing job, and which of the plurality of devices on the local area network will perform the informing job, wherein when information is received at the communication device, a determination is made on how to provide the received information based on settings included in the properties file.

Donoho et al. fails to teach or suggest the properties file producing device and the properties file as claimed. The Examiner relies upon the advisory file to teach the properties file of the present invention. The advisory file of *Donoho et al.* is generated at the advice provider's advice site and transmitted to the advice reader. The details of the advisories are discussed at col. 14, lines 26-60. There are no settings in the advisory file that include any of those elements as recited in claim 1. Further there are no settings in the advisory file that contribute to determining how the received information should be provided.

In addition to the above arguments, the Examiner relies on col. 15, lines 1-13 to teach whether the informing job will be performed automatically or manually. However, col. 15, lines 1-13, merely provides a description of the site description file (SDF) that includes parameters relating to the recommended frequency of synchronization. There is no information in the SDF that teaches settings relating to whether the informing job will be performed automatically or manually and further, the SDF is not the advisory file the Examiner is relying up to teach the properties file of the claimed invention. Finally, the advisory information is not provided to at least one of the plurality of devices within the local area network according to the determination made based on the settings in the properties file produced by the properties file producing device.

As neither *Donoho et al.* nor *Focsancanu et al.* teach, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the claim elements, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the references as cited. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4, and 17-21 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based upon their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 13 include elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and thus these claims, together with claims dependent thereon, are patentable over the references as cited for the reasons as set forth above with regard to claim 1.

In support of the rejection of claim 14, the Examiner asserts that *Donoho et al.* discloses automatically transferring the information to a printing device citing to col. 26, lines 59-60 and col. 37, lines 30-40. However, these citations fail to teach or suggest automatically transferring the information to a printing device for printing.

Further, with regard to the rejection of claim 15, the Examiner refers to his rejection of claim 2. However, claim 2 is not rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Donoho et al.* in view of *Focsancanu et al.* Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Donoho et al.* and *Focsancanu et al.*, and further in view of *Stumer*. Further, the elements set forth in claim 15 are of completely different scope than those elements set forth in claim 2. As such, Applicants cannot ascertain how the Examiner is rejecting claim 15.

Should the Examiner maintain his rejection of claim 15, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner clearly identify what references the Examiner is relying upon to teach of the claimed elements and establish a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness so that Applicants may have an appropriate opportunity to respond in a new, non-final Official Action.

Still further, with regard to the Examiner's rejection of claim 16, the Examiner asserts that *Donoho et al.* teaches establishing a communication channel between a device storing the properties file (Fig. 5, element 50) and another of the plurality of devices (item 60, 65, and 67; Fig. 6) on the local area network based on the settings in the properties file (col. 23, lines 27-57). First, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Donoho et al.* that discusses a local area network as suggested by the Examiner. Second, the communication channel between the advice provider's

advice site and the advice reader is not based on any information that is stored in the advisory file. Finally, elements 60, 65, and 67 represent one device, the advice reader, and not a plurality of devices as suggested by the Examiner.

For all these reasons it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet, Reg. No. 52,327 at the telephone number below. Facsimile communications may be sent to facsimile number (703) 205-8050.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Marc S. Weiner

Registration No.: 32,181

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant